

REMARKS

Claims 24 and 30 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 24, 26, 27 and 30 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment. Claims 1, 24 and 30 are the independent claims.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 24, 26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kwon et al (EP 0 851 714).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites a donor film of a low molecular weight full color organic electroluminescent display device, the donor film comprising, amongst other novel features, a substrate film, a photothermal conversion layer formed on an upper part of the substrate film, and a transfer layer formed on an upper part of the photothermal conversion layer and formed of a material comprising a low molecular weight material, wherein the transfer layer comprises a hole blocking layer.

The Office Action recognizes that Kwon does not teach a hole blocking layer, but states that since Kwon discloses a layer comprising TAZ, which can be an element of a hole blocking layer as stated in U.S. Patent No. 5,869,199 to Kido, the layer disclosed by Kwon is a hole blocking layer.

However, Applicants note that Kido not only teaches that TAZ has hole-blocking properties and thus can be used in a hole blocking layer, but Kido also teaches that TAZ has excellent electron-transport properties and thus can be used in an electron transport layer. Accordingly, since TAZ can be used in more than one type of layer, it is improper for the Office Action to imply that Kwon teaches a hole blocking layer.

Furthermore, Kwon does not mention or state anywhere in the specification a hole blocking layer.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth

in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)."

In the instant case, since the Office Action recognizes that Kwon does not disclose or suggest a hole blocking layer and since the material disclosed by Kwon can be used in layers other than a hole blocking layer, Applicants respectfully assert that Kwon does not teach or suggest every element of independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and/or 103(a) should be withdrawn because Kwon fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 24 and 30, it is noted that these claims recite some substantially similar features as claim 1. Thus, the rejections of these claims are also traversed for the reasons set forth above.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7-11 and 26 are allowable at least because of their dependency from claim 1, and because they include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 5, 7-11 and 26 also distinguish over the prior art.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11, 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Akai (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0045021).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites a donor film of a low molecular weight full color organic electroluminescent display device, the donor film comprising, amongst other novel features, a substrate film, a photothermal conversion layer formed on an upper part of the substrate film, and a transfer layer formed on an upper part of the photothermal conversion layer and formed of a material comprising a low molecular weight material, wherein the transfer layer comprises a hole blocking layer.

The Office Action recognizes that Akai does not teach a hole blocking layer, but states that since Akai discloses a layer having triazole derivatives, and since triazole derivatives can be used in a hole blocking layer, the layer is a hole blocking layer.

However, as noted above, since triazole derivatives can be used in layers other than hole blocking layers, Akai in fact fails to teach every element of independent claim 1.

Furthermore, since Akai does not mention or state anywhere in the specification a hole blocking layer, Akai does not teach or suggest a hole blocking layer, as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and/or 103(a) should be withdrawn because Akai, fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 24 and 30, it is noted that these claims recite some substantially similar features as claim 1. Thus, the rejections of these claims are also traversed for the reasons set forth above.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2, 3, 6-9 and 11 are allowable at least because of their dependency from claim 1, and because they include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 6-9 and 11 also distinguish over the prior art.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claim 27 is again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwon et al. (EP 0 851 714) in view of Fujita et al.(U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0008224).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reason.

It is noted that claim 27 depends from claim 26 which in turns depend from independent claim 1. As noted above, Kwon does not teach or suggest the novel features of independent claim 1.

Fujita is relied upon solely for a teaching of a gas generating layer, but fails to teach or suggest any of the novel features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, Fujita fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwon.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Kwon nor Fujita, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1 upon which claim 27 depends.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: _____

2/21/08

By: _____



Michael D. Stein
Registration No. 37,240

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510